Organizational Memorialization: Spatial History and Legitimation as Chiasms

François-Xavier de Vaujany[1], Emmanuelle Vaast[2], Stewart Clegg[3,4,5] and Jeremy Aroles[6]

[1]University Paris-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75016 Paris, France. Email : devaujany@dauphine.fr

[2]Desaultels Faculty of Management, McGill University, 1001 Sherbrooke St W, Montreal, QC H3A 1G5, Canada

[3]University of Technology Sydney, UTS Business School, 14-28 Ultimo Road, Ultimo NSW 2007, Australia

[4]Nova School of Business and Economics, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Campus de Campolide, 1099-032 Lisbon, Portugal

[5]University of Newcastle Business School, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU UK

[6]Durham University Business School, Mill Hill Lane, DH1 3LB, Durham, UK

Structured Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to understand how historical materialities might play a contemporary role in legitimation processes through the memorialization of history and its reproduction in the here-and-now of organizations and organizing.

Design/methodology/approach – The authors briefly review the existing Management and Organization Studies (MOS) literature on legitimacy, space and history, engage with the work of Merleau-Ponty to explore how organisational legitimacy is managed in time and space and use the case of two Parisian universities to illustrate the main arguments of the paper.

Findings – The paper develops a history-based phenomenological perspective on legitimation processes constitutive of four possibilities identified by means of chiasms: heterotopic spatial legacy, thin spatial legacy, institutionalized spatial legacy and organizational spatial legacy.

Research limitations/implications – The authors discuss the implications of this research for the neo-institutional literature on organizational legitimacy, research on organizational space and the field of management history.

Originality/value – This paper takes inspiration from the work of Merleau-Ponty on chiasms to conceptualize how the temporal layers of space and place that organizations inhabit and inherit (which we call 'spatial legacies'), in the process of legitimation, evoke a sensible tenor.

Keywords – Legitimation; History, Space; Time; Spatial Legacy; Merleau-Ponty; Memorialization

Paper type – Conceptual pape

"Without history, memory is open to abuse" (Judt and Snyder, 2012: 278)

Introduction

History, understood as a recollection of times past recorded for present memories and as the narratives that historians weave from its traces (Mills et al., 2013; Rowlinson et al., 2014), constitutes a form of causality that has so far not provided a major approach in management and organization studies that have been more oriented to cross-sectional notions of causality. However, times are changing; in the wake of contributions by Clark and Rowlinson (2004), Kieser (1987, 1994), Üsdiken and Kipping (2014) and Zald (1993, 1996), distinct approaches to historical organization studies are apparent (Maclean et al., 2016). Drawing on these, we extend historically oriented work through innovation with regard to how the past is approached and conceptualised. Traces of times past have hitherto been appropriated largely in overwhelmingly discursive terms: accounts, memoranda, oral histories, official documents, and so on. We do not live merely in a world of discursive semiotics, however; there are all those material phenomena, in which history resides. Indeed, building, art, gestures and archives are not only raw materials for history (Gosden, 1994) but also key dimensions of processes of remembering and forgetting (Petani and Mengis, 2016; Ricoeur, 2000) as well as the legitimacy claims that these processes sometimes ground (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014). Likewise, the absence of archives and the lack or silence of material traces may also be meaningful for organizational history (Decker, 2013).

Materially, historical uses of space produce legitimacy claims about organizational practices (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014; Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005).

Spatially embedded matter (Gagliardi, 1990a) is data that communicates materialized meaning symbolically. Materialized meaning is a rhetorical 'strategic asset' (Brunninge, 2009; Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005; Suddaby et al., 2010) having both instrumental as well as symbolic values. Organizations use the materialized meaning of history, especially their spatial legacies, to impress on stakeholders that they are 'desirable, proper, or appropriate' (Suchman, 1995: 574). Organizational narratives that enact historical legitimacy using legacy, heritage or antecedent to evoke an emotional response, use 'spatial legacy' (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014) as a basis for memorialization. Indeed, history and that which embodies it plays a major moral role for organizations and society (Petani and Mengis, 2016; Ricoeur, 2000). What is significant is how legitimacy claims select, interpret, enact, make visible, sensible and perform as a legacy to be memorialized material aspects of organization space (Gastelaars, 2010; Petani and Mengis, 2016; Ricoeur, 2000). Social organization in the here-and-now constructs spatial legacies from temporalities situated there-and-then. They do so strategically to situate and frame core contemporary values (Shipp and Jansen, 2011) in the context of their symbolic space (Decker, 2014; de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014). Doing this is one of the important ways in which history becomes lived experience rather than being archived as the 'past'; instead, it becomes an active and emotional source of present agency (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2013, 1964) connected to various forms of materialities, and most of all, a layered experience of the past based on depth (Mazis, 2016).

Building on these contributions, we are concerned with how historical materialities might play a contemporary role in legitimation processes through the memorialization of history and its reproduction in the here-and-now of organizations. We

take inspiration from the work of Merleau-Ponty on chiasms to conceptualize how the temporal layers of space and place that organizations inhabit and inherit (which we call 'spatial legacies') evoke a sensible tenor that materialises specific legitimacy claims. We use two case narratives (each representing a French university) to illustrate our argument and elaborate four kinds of sensible legacies that organizations can draw on in the process of memorialization, namely heterotopic spatial legacy, thin spatial legacy, institutionalized spatial legacy and organizational spatial legacy.

The paper is structured as follows. We begin by addressing organizational legitimacy and its management. We argue for the significance of spatial practices in the elaboration of legitimacy claims, in particular the fabric of historically based legitimacy claims. Drawing on Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and philosophy of history, we describe four phenomenological space-time assemblages that can be jointly produced by peoples' everyday activities and legitimacy claims. The cases of two Parisian universities are used to illustrate material contexts in which organizational members variably memorialize their actions. In this final section, the implications of this work for scholarship concerned with legitimacy and neo-institutionalism, organizational space and management history are discussed.

Managing and memorializing organizational legitimacy

Managing legitimacy

Legitimacy corresponds to 'a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions' (Suchman 1995: 574) premised on a pragmatic,

moral or cognitive fit between organizations and stakeholders' expectations. Pragmatic legitimacy relies upon the self-interest of the organization's audience; moral legitimacy involves positive meaning associated with the organization and its activities, while cognitive legitimacy is based upon the comprehensibility and 'taken-for-grantedness' of the organization (Suchman, 1995; Zimmerman and Zeitz, 2002). Temporality aids legitimacy as organizations acquire resources (King and Whetten, 2008) with which to develop and strategically transform (Zimmerman and Zeitz, 2002) claims to legitimacy. As argued by Suddaby et al. (2010: 14), 'History is a social and rhetorical construction that can be shaped and manipulated to motivate, persuade, and frame action, both within and outside an organization. Viewed as a malleable construct, the capacity to manage history can, itself, be a rare and inimitable resource'.

Organizations hosting historically premised legitimacy claims reify their dynamics by describing the organization as an *evolving entity*. Managing legitimacy seeks to skew information and criteria involved in substantive judgments (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2013) by various organization stakeholders (Ashforth and Gibbs, 1990; Suchman, 1995), seeking a degree of alignment and consistency among them. Managing legitimacy changes over time (Drori and Honig, 2013) as organizations gain, maintain and repair legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). Traditions are invented and innovated (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). Maintaining tradition is a process without end: 'managers rarely can afford to treat legitimation as a completed task' (Suchman, 1995: 594). Organizational legitimacy, faced with 'a reactive response to an unforeseen crisis of meaning' (Suchman, 1995: 597), frequently requires repair (Ashforth and Gibbs, 1990). Established organizations require constant attention and occasional repair while new

organizations ‘face the daunting task of winning acceptance either for the propriety of the activity in general or for their own validity as practitioners’ (Suchman, 1995: 586).

Linking contemporary experience to collective representation of a past whose material traces evoke ‘legacy’ strives to materialize an emotional relation between present perceptions and historically grounded legitimacies. Staging such invocation is typically designed to produce those embodied perceptions in historical contexts and a sense of continuity, as described by Merleau-Ponty (1945). Control of these contexts can only ever be partial: their staging, performativity and materiality cannot predicate or guarantee their reception amongst organizational visitors, members or spectators from further afield. The staging of legacy is always subject to the reception of audiences that may not be as cued to the historical coding as the producers would prefer; signs, semiotics and meaning decay with the passing of old times into new that are neither receptive nor able to perceive the echoes of the past in the present.

Memorializing legitimacy

Managing historical positioning involves the creation and maintenance of what Judt and Snyder (2012: 199) refer to as ‘public memory’. Memorialization provides both the material and the subject of history. Memorialization, as organizational production of discursive accounts as claims to legitimacy (Elsbach and Sutton, 1992; Mazza, 1999), generates cues that strive to manage audiences’ perceptions of the organization (Dowling and Pfeffer, 1975; Patriotta et al., 2011; Suchman, 1995), as well as the creation of material *aide mémoire*, signs interpreting the past in the present, ranging from discursive inscriptions such as plaques to materializations cast in statues and buildings. Judt and

Snyder (2012: 277) note a significant difference between memory and history: 'Whereas history of necessity takes the form of a record, endlessly rewritten and re-tested against old and new evidence, memory is keyed to public, non-scholarly purposes: a theme park, a memorial, a museum, a building, a television program, and event, a day, a flag'.

Identifying dynamics in "organizational" memories is the process and stuff of organizational history (Le Goff, 2006, 2014). Memory and commemoration are always constructed from the perspective of specific actors or stakeholders that orchestrate and perform its staging; however, its staging demands an audience. Organizing history, as memorialization, entails deliberately playing with visible material and symbolic signs and sentiments. While memorialization draws on history it is not history: it is a putative keying of emotions through instrumental appropriation of selected aspects of a past imagined in a present that informs a possible future.

History and organizational legitimation

Recent scholarship highlights how organizational history supports legitimacy, often in ideationally abstract terms (see Decker, 2014; de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014). Examples include research on so-called 'mnemonic practices' (Olick and Robbins, 1998) as well as the effects of social memory (Kleinman and Kleinman, 1994). Institutional research increasingly acknowledges the role of history in the management of legitimacy (see e.g. Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001; Sangren, 1988; Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005). Recent work at the crossroads of neo-institutionalism and management history conceives organizational history as a 'reservoir' for rhetorical strategies managing organizational legitimacy (Navis and Glynn, 2010; Suddaby et al., 2010, 2014). An organization's

selective constructions of history and their performance as a tradition can make current rhetoric more compelling, especially in turbulent contexts (such as mergers, innovation, etc.), which question the continuity and obviousness of collective activity (Maclean et al., 2013, 2015; Suddaby et al., 2010). Contemporary organizations that can cue historical recursivity premised on previous memories (e.g. Navis and Glynn, 2010; Suddaby et al., 2010) strive to establish strategic branding producing emotional nostalgia that fuses with deference to imagined tradition. Important as the uses of the past may be, in certain instances it will be the case organisations are not keen to remember or preserve a particular past or history (see Clegg et al., 2006; Köster, 2011; Maclean et al., 2017). Anyhow, organizational history can be adjusted rhetorically to various legitimation requirements (Gioia et al., 2002; Sangren, 1988), building a foundation for a distinct contemporary image (Foster and Hyatt, 2008) informed by strategies stressing origins and founders' myths (Basque and Langley, 2018).

Signs signify; inscriptions abound; materialities matter (Barad, 2003). Not all signs are discursive and not all inscriptions take the form of words. Moreover, shifting relevance and reference to what has been and will be remembered and forgotten is inescapable. Perhaps the temporality and differentiation of memory explains why insufficient attention has been paid to the ways in which material artefacts of memorialization, such as internal archives, museums, objects or digital data (Barros et al., 2019; Wadhwani et al., 2018), as well as spaces in general, have been represented in organization studies, with a few significant exceptions, such as Decker (2014). Space is a prime means for managing and displaying legitimacy, framing embodied practices and

emotional experiences as Dacin et al. (2010) explore in their analysis of 'Cambridge dining'.

Organizational space

Organizational Space and Legitimacy

The notion of organizational space includes those material and symbolic practices used to delineate and frame organization activities (Gagliardi, 1990a). Space is highly material and embodied: not only being there and being occupied but also being symbolically produced, reproduced and embedded in diverse materialities. Space is socio-material; its being there and being occupied or not connotes meanings. Recent scholarship on sociomateriality recognizes the connection between material and symbolic aspects of organizational space (Leonardi, 2013; Leonardi and Barley, 2010; Orlikowski, 2007; Petani and Mengis, 2016).

Organizational and urban spaces affect how organizations manage their legitimacy, as illustrated in Deroy and Clegg's (2012) work on corporate presence on the Champs Elysées in Paris or in Fenske and Holdsworth's (1990) account of the rise of office buildings in New York City at the turn of the 20th century. Space and its framing represent an organization symbolically (Hancock and Spicer, 2011; Van Marrewijk, 2009; Van Marrewijk and Yanow, 2010) just as do the textual accounts that organizations produce (Elsbach and Sutton, 1992).

Organizations may not control the impressions 'given off' (Gardner and Martinko, 1988) by their material environment. There may be consistency or discrepancy between organizational discourse and spatial embodiment. Organizational spaces are

materially and symbolically *constructed* through the flow of everyday activities (Lefebvre, 1991). Over time, stakeholders who re-visit an organization, even where the space ostensibly remains the same (i.e. no change in headquarters or no major renovations), can be struck both by how similar and different the space has become in its *use* and the *representations* made of it. For instance, although all universities are engaged in essentially similar practices of teaching and research, seasoned observers will notice subtle differences in their spatial framing. In Europe, for example, some are pastoral; others are civic red brick while others contemporary concrete and glass, with sandstone hallmarking tradition. These differences are essential to the branding strategies that universities use to promote themselves (see Berti et al., 2018; Hancock and Spicer, 2011): in a given cityscape various examples of high modernity, cool postmodernity and traditional 'dreaming spires' may all be emblematic of the 'essence' of different universities.

Historical space and collective activity: Spatial legacy, skeuomorph and relics

Past social and material dynamics may be captured discursively in repositories (Gagliardi, 1990b; Peltonen, 2011), where corporate or societal archives (Decker, 2014) create a repository that is reproduced, maintained and transformed by numerous events of commemoration and acknowledgement as well as processes of textual revision. A repository is subject to changing frames and fashions, much as were photographs of the legacy of Soviet leadership. Memory is, as Judt and Snyder (2012: 276-7) say, 'disposed to seduce and be seduced'. The legacy that is celebrated is the legacy remembered – in every sense of that word.

Through practices of re-membering and forgetting organizations produce enduring "legacies" that both *bind* and *enable* as they occlude and expose those potentially contentious elements from the past that might be constituted as legacy (Ricoeur, 2000). Metaphorically, as archaeologists remind us, spaces are sedimented (e.g. Cole, 2013; Pesez, 1978) including multiple deposits, sometimes from the distant past. Organizations *are* sedimented structures (Clegg, 1981) that reflect not only the past actions of their users but also those social constructions remembered, repressed or otherwise forgotten. It does not mean that this past cannot be altered or strategically mobilized but rather that is has been assembled through layers of events and narrations. The stratification of symbolic and material artefacts in organizational spaces as legacy (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014) enables artefacts to be told, shown, indexed and enacted to sustain organizational rhetoric and legitimacy claims (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005; Suddaby et al., 2010). These processes institutionalize a preferred historical dimension to organizational space and its artefacts (Gosden, 1994).

Situating the space of organizational materiality temporally accounts for both its "durable" and "mutable" (Gastelaars, 2010) aspects. Material spaces are durable, most evidently when there are centuries-old buildings still in use (Dacin et al., 2010). They are mutable, most evidently when temporary sites, removals, relocations, renovations, remodelling or more generally, the dynamics of territoriality (Brown et al., 2005) occur. As Peltonen (2011: 828) noted, 'architectonically reasoned spatial solutions persist in some form even though the societal ideas and aesthetics of organizational environments have changed over time'. When a very old building hosts new activities such as an innovation lab or a business incubator or it is seen as something that could become

functional once more – its legacy can be rejuvenated, renewed or even re-made, and incorporated into contemporary habitus.

Lowenthal (1985, 2014) talks about "relics" of the past and about the "heritage" of history being projected onto contemporary landscapes. Spatial legacies, similarly, are produced over time and their meaning can change through time according to the actors who experience them and may turn them into 'social memory assets'. Some organizations play strategically with their past to manage present claims to legitimacy. For instance, corporate archivists may be employed to sift through, curate and ultimately build and interpret archives in order to convert raw information to memory. Any organization, over time, experiences an accumulation of stories and artefacts that can be memorialized (Cole, 2013). Organizational memory is an on-going process (Do et al., 2019; Ravasi et al., 2019), making some things visible while others are, purposely or not, occluded (Anteby and Molnár, 2012). Similarly, organizational spaces accumulate legacies that have material and symbolic dimensions, whose value and meaning change over time.

The strata constituting spatial legacies are highly interpretative and grounded in everyday activities that have their own temporal orientations, drawing on specific temporal structures (e.g. on-going projects). Activities change both symbolically and materially; in terms of actions, time modifies narratives, leading to periodicity in organizational memory and in how past strata and periods relate to each other (e.g. by changing the flow of a narrative on a website or the chronology used to classify corporate archives). In contrast to a legacy, Hayles (1999) identified a skeuomorph, which is defined as 'a design feature that is no longer functional in itself but that refers back to a feature that was functional at an earlier time'. Put differently, a skeuomorph refers to an

element of design that has somehow lost its original function but is nonetheless retained. People no longer use or live in its space. Its past uses are lost and no longer remembered; its contemporary usefulness not recognized, and its obsolescence no longer interrogated.

Managing organizational legitimacy in space and time: A Merleau-Pontian approach

The Dynamics of Organizational Space, Legitimacy and History: visibility-invisibility, passivity-activity, continuity-discontinuity loops of the past

For Merleau-Ponty (1964), it is necessary to create many visibilities to favour invisibilities and conversely create invisibilities to improve visibility. Importantly though, visibilities and invisibilities are not the opposite of one another. They are both required to constitute a time, an instantaneity (the problem is also inextricably temporal) that will enable people not to be lost in endless anticipation and projection into the future or be consciously freezing memories of the past; in other words, 'one needs to put aside both nostalgia (a disturbing past) and anxiety (an impending future) without remaining trapped in the present' (De Vaujany and Aroles, 2019: 211). Adrift in the present, organizational elites memorialize elements of the past as they anticipate their futures, through visibility-invisibility loops (Merleau-Ponty, 1964) that have a historicity.

Likewise, continuities and discontinuities are at the heart of the chiasmatic experience of the world. In order to acting upon and constitute the world, we need to feel both our own continuity and that of our actions. This continuity makes it possible to discontinue our actions, delimit them and elaborate the mnemonic markers of what we did or will do. For Merleau-Ponty (1964), discontinuity is not just about 'novelty'; it is

also about interruptions, suspensions and fractures in our world. Besides, for perceptual efficacy, these discontinuities are necessarily enmeshed into continuities (and vice versa). The same is true for activity and passivity. To be in the past or present teleology of our actions, we need to become passive about key things which could be enacted by our senses. Even our retrospective explorations make passive (and invisible) some memories and potentialities. Thus, passivity-continuity-invisibility backwards on the one hand, and activity-discontinuity-visibility ahead on the other, are at the heart of our experience of the world and of how we learn and forget about it. This is one idea we also find in the phenomenology of history offered by Ricoeur (1985, 2000). History is a retrospective and prospective process of remembering and forgetting at the same time (Ibid.). Importantly, this chiasmatic dimension of both spacing and temporalizing is rarely addressed in the contemporary MOS literature on space, place and organizational history, in particular in the study of organizational legitimation (de Vaujany, 2019).

Merleau-Ponty's emphasis on depth resonates with accounts on space and spacing (Mazis, 2016); "depth" is much more important than "perspective" in the experience of both space and time. What matters is not so much the geometrical distance between bodies, objects and gestures so much as the felt depth of our field of experience. How far our own movement leads in space and time defines the depth of our experience phenomenologically. Depth is also about the level of embodied engagement we have in a situation. Depth does not mean necessarily a visible, explicit or abundant materiality. Silence (e.g. of archives) can signify something of great depth (de Vaujany and Aroles, 2019; Mazis, 2016). Interestingly, Merleau-Ponty establishes a verticality in our experience of space. There can be various perceptual and emotional layers in our

experience of the world, made of past emotions themselves interwoven with past gestures, objects, meanings and narratives.

Merleau-Ponty's criticism of judgement and inclination for post-judgmental views of everyday activities is an invitation particularly interesting for neo-institutional analysis and its views of legitimacy and legitimation, seen mainly in terms of a judgement (Bitektine, 2011). In one of his key writings (a set of lectures delivered at the Collège de France in 1954 and 1955), Merleau-Ponty (2003/2015) conceptualized 'institutions' (and institutionalization). An institution is a process of self-activation that contributes to creating the conditions of its own continuity. Institutionalization involves social action in the face of events, often through the use of old schemes, making it possible to focus on process and to create minimal continuity through change. Memories are made and preserved this way. It is worth highlighting that for Merleau-Ponty (2003, part I), time and history are "institutions". They are what order and give a direction to collective activity, their very eventfulness. *They are these very passivities of our lives which are most of the time not visible for ourselves and whose continuity is never questioned. They are the epitome of an institution, THE institution (Ibid.).* They are the 'happening' at the heart of our experience of the world.

Conceptualizing memorialization

From the phenomenological perspective of Merleau-Ponty, we can distinguish memorialization in terms of four kinds of spatial legacy, based on two axes that derive from Rämö (1999). From the embodied perceptions of people involved in organizational activities, we distinguish between a spatial axis ('space' versus 'place') and a temporal

axis (‘deep’ history versus ‘shallow’ history). The spatial axis distinguishes perceptions of bounded and situated scenes for distinct collective activities (spaces) that have a clear volume and well-defined symbolical and physical boundaries, from open scenes that are parts of a landscape and territory (places), which are locations for collective activities (with fuzzy symbolic and physical boundaries). Space (locus of discontinuity, i.e. they begin and end at some point) signifies the site of specific situated actions, a distinct institutional and organizational habitus. Places (locus of atmosphere and presence, a ‘here’ which is not bounded and discontinuous), typically, are scenes of mobile and random encounters unbounded by organization, although they may become temporary sites for collective activity, such as produce markets that materialize in the same place at the same times while not occupying the place continuously. The temporal axis relates to the historical density of specific sets of material artefacts and practices accumulated through collective activities. The historical density may be thick (visible) or thin (invisible), depending both on the duration and richness of collective activities studied. These different densities of temporality are more or less easy to identify, depending on the level of passivity and openness and the phenomenological perspective of people exploring the scene, the extent to which they easily project their selfhood and their physical presence on the scene. Our two axes result in the following matrix:

		SPATIAL DIMENSION (Type of spatial arrangement of collective activity as experienced by organizational members in the flow of their activities)	
		PLACE	**SPACE**
TEMPORAL			

DIMENSION (Number of historical periods and strata related to the spatial setting of collective activity as experienced by organizational members)	**HISTORICALLY THICK**	**S1: Heterotopic spatial legacy**	**S3: Institutionalized spatial legacy**
	HISTORICALLY THIN	**S2: Thin spatial legacy**	**S4: Organizational spatial legacy**

Table 1. Four configurations of spatial legacies

The first situation (*heterotopic spatial legacy*) is epitomized by typical places such as old Parisian bistros. For someone taking a drink, seating for a coffee at the terrace or eating 'inside', these spaces have extremely fuzzy spatial and temporal boundaries (Augé, 2015). Where do they stop? Do their walls contain space when it spills out on to pavements and terraces? A typical Parisian bistro can include a high degree of memorial density (e.g. be embedded in literary memories), a thick 'history' related to the immediate *quartier* (though pictures), various pieces of furniture from different periods, several apparels behind the 'zinc', etc. Some of these artefacts can have been left or given by customers themselves. Bistro owners can orientate customers' perceptions to their spaces through markers of identity that, memorially, justify their activity and continuity in front of customers, competitors and context. Indeed, they are highly heterotopic in Foucault's sense. These places are linked to open spatio-temporal entities, which everybody can reach and leave. In this context, imagination can run free: a photograph of de Beauvoir and Sartre can activate literary memories, memories of political debate as well as

existential ideas. A democracy of places (*le quartier* in French) connects distinct spatial identities in a memory of place.

The second situation (*historically thin spatial legacy*) is more typical of open places with either a recent history or one that has become meaningless because it no longer has connection for owners and/or visitors experiencing it (the artefacts it contains have become "skeuomorph", see Hayles, 1999). The contemporary stories 'hosted' by this new place convey or destroy legitimacy claims. Herein, explicit architectural design and interior styling becomes vitally significant: the iconicity of a structure can support unique claims in a way that the visually bland cannot. The signature of the star architect or a unique story associated with a building, can transform thinness into a density that connects globally. Short of such signature or stories the new admits of little shock; blandness encourages little memorialization.

The third situation (*Institutionalized spatial legacy*) involves a situation of thick history (with the perception of numerous periods and related strata of historical artefacts) and a place with fuzzy organizational spaces. Thick history makes the memorial identity of the entity at stake almost impossible to be seen, because at first glance it is only a set of meaningless ruins, or a jumble of styles and epochs, or something too distributed (both in space and time). Sites, whose archaeology is a constant unfolding, are a case in point, as layers of the past are removed to reveal yet more layers.

The fourth situation (*organizational spatial legacy*) is more typical of contemporary firms' buildings in big cities. Many such firms are hosted in recent buildings (sometimes with an interesting history about the place itself) or have appropriated past buildings with a former history. The joint history of the building and

the company or the older history of the building and its former inhabitants can be memorialized to produce various legitimacy claims. They can provide a repertoire that managers will draw on to legitimate their activities; hence the attraction of old warehouses and factory buildings for funky start-up entrepreneurs. One of the key issues (in a situation where there is clearly an inside and an outside) will be how to share a common knowledge with which external stakeholders can play.

In each of the situations presented, managing legitimacy is temporally and institutionally situated depending on how the requirements of the organization are entangled with the textuality of the building and how, memorially, legitimacy is enacted by emotions and intersubjective activities. Merleau-Ponty's (1964, 2010) three key chiasms (continuity-discontinuity, passivity-activity and visibility-invisibility) are not at stake in the same way. In this paper, we use two case narratives to illustrate a possible path memorialized by organization members to justify their actions to themselves and those that accompany them. Our two case narratives draw from archival and historical data, our personal knowledge as well as the study of various documentary sources and visual elements (see de Vaujany and Vaast, 2016; Gastelaars, 2010; Meyer et al., 2013). The two cases will illustrate the temporal-spatial configurations we have described and how people provide legitimacy claims in these specific contexts (See Apppendix). The first case concerns the Université Paris-Dauphine and the second, La Sorbonne. While both are prestigious institutions, they have a very different history, occupy a different space and are constitutive of different temporalities. As such, they represent interesting cases to explore the manifold intertwinements between space, memory and legitimacy.

Two Parisian universities

Université Paris-Dauphine: From Space to Place, Opening Legitimacy Claims

The University of Paris-Dauphine illustrates how new organizations may build a sense of legitimacy by borrowing spatial legacies from their broader locale. Paris-Dauphine was established relatively recently, after the 1968 student protests in France. It entered a context dominated by secular French Universities, such as La Sorbonne, that had a very deep history. The University (epitomizing situation 4 of our matrix) occupies the former NATO headquarters vacated two years before (when de Gaulle left NATO). Not only was the NATO building large enough to accommodate high enrolments but its historical idiosyncrasies helped establish the legitimacy of the University.

Even though it was institutionally unrelated to NATO, the new University referenced NATO in its first official logo, explicitly generating an organizational spatial legacy. Similarly, the building kept the stars originally associated with NATO at the top of its entry gates. Although the stars now hold no specific meaning, the new University displayed them prominently in its early promotional material (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014; Richard and Waks, 2009). Moreover, the new University owes its very name to the memory of "Porte Dauphine," a gate that once demarcated the city of Paris from its outskirts as well as to a dolphin (associated with the word "dauphin") that has always been part of the University's logo (see figure 1).

Early 1970's **Logo 2014**

Figure 1. University Paris-Dauphine logos (Source: Archives of Université Paris-Dauphine)

The university is located in a very bourgeois *arrondissement* of Paris[1], the 16th. Housed in the shell of the former NATO building, the building was perceived as a fortress, especially when seeing it at that time in the 'hot' context of the cold war; this remains the case, visually, especially when viewed from the corner of the Avenue Foche or the rue Longchamp. The impression of its massive shape is strengthened by the presence of the Bois de Boulogne in the background. While students 'moved' to *Vincennes Université* (another new university in the east of Paris), others had to 'enter' into Dauphine. The embodied practice assumed by the vocabulary was very different (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014, 2016).

Using the visibilities-invisibilities loops described by Merleau-Ponty (1964), we can ask what were the 'visibilities' the first inhabitants of this newly re-purposed building could play with? Emotionally, for public and competing institutions, the building set the context of a prestigious location and an imposing structure. The emotional path developed made the place feel inaccessible, selective (ibid). The former NATO palace was a hermetic, massive, opaque building (it remains impossible to see what is going on

[1] See Le Wita (1994) for an overview and contextualisation of French bourgeois culture.

inside). Quickly, the early deans made Dauphine a selective institution (which was highly unusual in the 1970s and 1980s and still remains so today in France, outside of the *Grande Ecoles* system). Contemporaneously, however, in a context of increasing (global) competition, decrease of public funding (requiring a search for money in the direction of the proximate business district) and a concern with standards (e.g. accreditation and international publications), the old emotional register of the 'fortress' became more and more obsolete for academics, students, journalists and sponsors. It was increasingly necessary to make the place more 'corporate', open and transparent in the 2000s and more recently, a place more than a closed 'space' (Berti et al., 2018) that is more innovation, entrepreneur and makers' oriented.

In the changing context, the memory of its past, trading on the spatial legacies of the NATO period, became more and more of a skeuomorph for new comers, far from what their 'corporeal schema' could assimilate (Merleau-Ponty, 1945). That is why the building has experienced numerous renovations, with most of the NATO spatial legacy now physically and symbolically removed. More recently, the former NATO command room has been completely redesigned. Gradually, the generation that had a common memory of the cold war and an emotional understanding of the building's embeddedness in the aesthetic codes of a fortress, disappeared from the scene. For the new business leaders, parents and entrepreneurial start-ups that organizational members now need to convince, the building was no longer linked to appropriate emotional memories. The symbols of NATO, such as the general assembly hall, were redesigned to look more corporate, as were the library and cafeteria.

Most communication activities by the organization now draw on distributed spatial legacies that they make visible to a greater extent. There are several campuses in Paris, not only in Porte Dauphine but also now in the business district of La Défense, as well as abroad (e.g. in Tunis, Madrid, Frankfurt and London). The memory of the NATO building does not resonate with these newer offshoots. These territories are now part of the emotional discourses and experiences that organizational members try to share. As Dauphine, situated in the narrow territory of the 16th arrondissement in Paris, tries to make a broader world appeal through the global enactment of its teaching and research activities it does so through a frenetic sense of movement, in which the website plays a key role. Memorialization through the spatial legacy of NATO seems to have been displaced by the immediacy of the website.

La Sorbonne: from Place to Space, Reinventing the Material Reservoir and Agency of Legitimacy Claims

La Sorbonne, as a university, presents a very different situation to that of Paris-Dauphine. It has a much more prestigious, secular past. Yet, this past cannot be made visible to senses; it is a lost world that amounts to nothing phenomenologically visible. Established in the Middle Ages (set up in the 13th century, see Verger, 1973) its mediaeval spaces are but a memory. All the medieval buildings and renovations or extensions initiated prior to the 18th century have disappeared (Hottin, 1999). Today there is almost nothing material that is left (no skeuomorph, vestiges or spatial legacies) of its prestigious past. The Sorbonne's inception is ill documented: most documents charting its main institutional turns were produced long after the events in question; contemporary material is scarce

(Verger, 1973: 27). Its historical thickness is not the subject of convincing experiences that can be embodied in the gaze of pedestrians (in contrast to the Universities of Cambridge, Bologna or Oxford). Consequently, the Sorbonne's legitimacy claims have been driven less by visual and more by narrative memorialization. Artefacts are constructed descriptively in the flow of a structured discourse, designed to accompany tours and visits that seek to make tourists feel what *La Sorbonne* was and, in a way, still is: a secular university albeit one whose material past is largely lost.

What remains today of *La Sorbonne*, is a beautiful 19th century building (*Le palais de la Sorbonne*, erected by Henri-Paul Nénot, a student of Garnier, during the 3rd Empire) that presents *La Sorbonne Histoire* to visitors (e.g. through the pictures and statues it contains: https://www.sorbonne.fr/la-sorbonne/visiter-la-sorbonne/). It cannot be experienced sensually, immediately, other than as an institutionalized phenomenon. As a visitor, one can be instructed into seeing it: its memories are curated. The building contains a couple of artefacts that are relatively invisible and that are made apparent by storytelling. On the upper floors, visitors can spend time in front of a *statue de la République* designed by Léon Alexandre Delhomme in 1889 (at the time of the universal exhibition in Paris). Marianne hosts a two-edged sword turned over (a symbol of tolerance) in her left hand and the Goddess Minerva (Goddess of arts and sciences) in her right hand. She wears a Phrygian hat and what appears to be a crown of laurels on her head. A closer look, however, makes it is clear that they are not laurels but *fleurs-de-lis.* The designer of the statue (and the designer of the building who located the statue there) gives an interpretive flexibility to the statue and the place. From afar, the statue looks republican but on closer inspection it appears more monarchical (see Merleau-Ponty's

1945 phenomenological analysis of visual perception). A perceptual ‘depth’ is part of the conceived space.

At the time the building was erected, the republic was settled, albeit fragile. *L*a Sorbonne could enact royal traces in case of a return of the monarchy**.** Here, we clearly face ‘spatial legacies’ more than ‘skeuomorph’ and the embodied experience of the place as one is guided through it leads the visitor to a particular emotional register (republic) or another (monarchy). Its memorialization was ambiguous, plural and, from its inception, capable of historical resetting. The building is thus part of an institution as Merleau-Ponty (2003/2015) would define it: the process through which structures (e.g. deep temporal structures ordering events) are perpetuated and self-preserved through the solid and massive materiality of its shape, form and structure, the interpretive flexibility of the artefacts it hosts, and the evolving ritual of its presentation. One can see the entire statue from a distance or take a closer look at the crown she wears. In both cases, one accesses different layers (spatial legacies) of the place.

Beyond and before this fascinating building, *La Sorbonne* accumulated several centuries of history long strongly associated with the students’ quarters in Paris in terms of its buildings and location (Tuilier, 1994). It is here that its heterotopic spatial legacy is most evident in the many bars and cafes surrounding the Sorbonne that are as likely to play host to a seminar or discussion as are the limited number of available rooms and offices in the building itself. After the riots of the students’ movement of May 1968, when the University administration shut the university down, more than 20,000 students, teachers and supporters marched towards the Sorbonne, sealed off by riot police who, batons flailing, charged as the marchers approached, the latter tearing up cobbles to use

as projectiles as they were attacked, forcing the police to retreat before responding with tear gas and further charges. After the events of May, ’68, La Sorbonne started to distance itself symbolically and materially from these historical buildings and their ecology of heterotopic spatial legacies of rebellion as it multiplied into smaller, satellite locations in more modern buildings (Charle and Verger, 1990; Hottin, 2011). While doing so, it tried to convey an impression of adaptability and innovation.

Since the mid-2000s, La Sorbonne has faced growing pressures related to internationalization and the trend towards accreditation in higher education. In order to maintain its standing in this increasingly competitive environment, it has symbolically and materially gone back to its roots, emphasizing the richness of its long history to reinforce legitimacy. In contemporary times, it has restored its original chapel to its former glory, a building that had long been the spatial marker of the University and of its storied history (for instance, it hosts the grave of Cardinal Richelieu, the illustrious 17th century French politician) and has marketed the renovation as a key element in its branding, as part of its strategy of memorializing spatial history. For the present-day university, the events of May ’68 are hardly a memory that the authorities celebrate.

Implications and future research

This conceptual paper has provided a spatial perspective on organizational memorialization and its use by managers in order to show how organizational members play up their legacies, or minimize them, to manage their legitimacy for key external stakeholders as well as how they adjust their spatial practices accordingly. Legitimacy based upon memorialized history is difficult to posit without a stream of practice on

which to lay foundations. Building upon this conceptualization, we now turn to the implications for scholarly work on organizational legitimacy and institutions, organizational space and management history.

Implications for Neo-institutional Literature on Organizational Legitimacy

We contribute to neo-institutional literature by offering a more systematic consideration of space and materiality. The concepts of spatial practices and spatial legacies, in particular, shed light on important legitimacy strategies. Through embodied practices, organizational members select, show, enact, and materialize both their organizational space and legitimating aspects of their memorialization. Through our matrix, we identified four possible situations: heterotopic spatial legacy, thin spatial legacy, institutionalized spatial legacy and organizational spatial legacy.

Cloutier and Langley (2013: 12) note the absence of materiality from the institutional logics perspective, acknowledging that while 'logics have material effects (effects on power, structure, and/or practices)' there has been a failure to recognize 'the materiality of logics themselves – for example, their representation in objects'. Lawrence et al. (2013) regret the absence of materiality and artefacts in institutional analysis more generally. Deeper historical, material, emotional and embodied consideration of institutional dynamics may be made by considering the spatial and material underpinnings of organizational legitimacy management, as we argue in this paper (also see de Vaujany, 2019; de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014; Lawrence et al., 2013; Raviola and Norbäck, 2013).

Neo-institutional research needs to address the theoretical significance of materiality, artefacts and history (see our four configurations). The present paper addresses the making and remaking of the past and its meaning, its memorialization, for an organization's legitimacy. The concept of spatial legacy, in particular, illuminates the combination of constraints and agency in the connection between space, history and organizational legitimacy. Recent research has proposed a largely ideational or discursive view of rhetoric for assuming legitimacy (Suddaby et al., 2010). In this paper we add to neo-institutionalism by unpacking concepts of spatial legacy and memorialization that organizations draw on to manage legitimacy. Organizations memorialize by selectively indexing their 'history' and corresponding spatial legacies for legitimacy management purposes. While memorialization frames meaning it can never be fully imposed on stakeholders. Merleau-Ponty's (1964) writing helped us conceptualize the visibility-invisibility loops involved in everyday activities, at the heart of this indexation.

Implications for Research on Organizational Space

Bringing a historical perspective into the analysis of organizational space helps research grasp the deeply imbricated social and material dimensions of space and their implications in the long run. Much literature focuses on the original design and architecture of an organizational space (see Clegg and Kornberger, 2006; van Marrewijk and Yanow, 2010). Bringing a more temporal and processual perspective into the investigation of space (with axis 2 of our matrix) adds an understanding of how a space, the artefacts and bodies it contains, become perceived, presented and re-presented (de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014; Gastelaars, 2010). Insofar as historical memory is a "strategic

asset" (Suddaby et al., 2010), organizational space can also be a key emotional reservoir and setting for the on-going construction of such assets.

Implications for Management History

By unpacking the concept of spatial legacies analytically, the paper contributes theoretically and methodologically to cross-fertilize historical and organization research (even if we do not claim here a historical approach, *stricto sensu*). As noted above, management historians have long relied upon discourse-based archives and artefacts (e.g., archival documents produced by organizations, such as human resources records or corporate annual reports). Some archaeologists (Cole, 2013) and material culture studies scholars (Pesez, 1978) access the long-gone past through material artefacts that survive as relics. Such work should encourage scholars to dig and construct original archives through a consideration of artefacts produced in the long term in organizational spaces.

The paper urges historians of organizations to situate corporate histories as created by practices of memorialization rather than as objective histories per se. Setting corporate histories within a broader context, reveals, in particular, how an organization's space is geographically, historically, and politically, embedded. Such embeddedness affects the extent to which an organization's claims to legitimacy may be convincing to the organization's stakeholders. As such, Merleau-Ponty's work, and in particular his chiasmatic dimensions, appears as a very helpful resource. From a phenomenological perspective, the consideration of organizational space, memory and legitimacy management therefore calls for an examination of the broader social, institutional, and political context and of the slow transformation of this context over the long term.

A further implication is to invite historians and archivists of organizations to be more reflexive about the role of their own work in the institutionalization, indeed the memorialization, of historical artefacts. What role do MOS journals, academic networks, doctoral programs and their respective processes play in the memorialization of our fields and our practices? What role do business schools and universities play or can play in memorialization, in the logic of museography[2], but also in the broader logic of categorizing the past (and remote past) of the practices they teach and research? Professional historians, be they academics or employed in industry, are key in deciding which artefacts may be relevantly labelled "historical". Doing so, willingly or not, they participate in a legitimation (or de-legitimation) process that comes from an appeal to history that actually builds memory. Such work thus calls attention to the potentially unintended consequences of field discovery and archival work that management historians seemingly engage in routinely. On a related note, spatial legacies are a complex construction involving multiple organizational stakeholders who may interpret these artefacts differently and may or may not consider them as memorially "historical." The interpretation and re-interpretations of the layers of artefacts and narratives constituting spatial legacies appear as the input and product of a long-term process of accumulation that arises from an organization's ongoing quest for legitimacy, rather than simply a search for "true" organizational memory or for short-term organizational effectiveness.

Considering processes of interpretation in the long-term can help researchers overcome two dualisms that Rowlinson et al. (2014) noted between history and

[2] See for instance the Museum of Entrepreneurship at Cass Business School (https://www.cass.city.ac.uk/news-and-events/news/2019/may/entrepreneurship-museum-launch-inspiring-next-generation-business-leaders).

organization theory: the dualism of evidence (i.e., historians rely on "*verifiable documentary sources*" whereas management and organization theorists favour "*constructed data*") and the dualism of temporality (i.e., historians reflexively construct their own periodization whereas management and organization scholars treat time "*as constant for chronology*"). Spatial legacies are both collected and constructed materials. Through the flow of on-going spatial practices, the historical space is continuously appropriated, re-appropriated or de-appropriated by the organization. Identifying the strata of artefacts and narratives constituting spatial legacies in a periodization process involves organizations and management historians alike in categorizing narratives and spaces as historical archives but possibly also remaining silent about some elements of the social context (Decker, 2013). As with all categorization and periodization, determining what constitutes historical archives of significance for a social entity such as an organization is a complex process that changes over time, according to contemporary institutional conditions (Le Goff, 2014).

Further building upon Decker (2013), we consider that management historians may relate their research on organization history and their multiple strata of artefacts and narratives to thus far implicit layers of "silence." Archives – such as those related to organization, their space, past, and legitimacy management – "talk" but what corporate or academic historians highlight as being of significance can also reveal a telling absence of archives:

> 'Many interpretative methodologies from the social sciences are not suited to understand the different layers of silences that are relevant to archival research. (…) While some degree of selection is usually necessary to deal with historical

> sources, the criticism of historical narratives has unduly focused on this level, ignoring the fact that this is just one layer of historical methodologies. Yet ironically, historians may have even more effectively silenced themselves when it comes to their methodological knowledge than they could have ever silenced their archives' (Decker, 2013: 169).

Our work can help management historians deal with what archives say, and what their absence also reveals, by offering a theoretical framework on the connections between organizational legitimacy, space and memory. It encourages organizational history scholars to turn reflexively to space and spatial legacies to build new archives (in particular those likely to describe emotions and embodiments) that talk about the organization and its memorial dynamics. Smith (2008) discusses the key role that phenomena such as regimental histories, toasts and banners play in creating small group solidarity, the construction of a soldierly identity, and the enlistment and control of emotions in building military effectiveness.

Beyond the concerns of this essay we want to invite Management and Organization Studies scholars to participate in ontological discussions about spatial legacies and legitimation processes. Merleau-Ponty offers a view of time and space as continuously constituted and reconstituted by embodied, more or less shared, activities. In this context, a spatial legacy is simply a past experience among others, connected to feelings, connecting it to other feelings and embodied experience, more or less open to curatorial memorialization. Legitimation related to this kind of spatial legacy will be the result of creating a shared, harmonious feeling relationally mediating collective experience. Legitimation, where achieved, is a shared feeling rather than a stable,

external, mental judgement.

Regarding Merleau-Ponty's work, we believe that future research on organizational memorialization could delve further into the three chiasmatic dimensions at the core of this paper. In particular, future research could explore contexts in which various processes of memorialization happen concomitantly, in a decentred and asynchronous way (e.g. social movements, sanitary crises, large companies owning numerous smaller companies with their own respective history, etc.). Merleau-Ponty's continuous search for a kind of universal humanism could have prevented him from exploring such diverse spatio-temporal contexts (see Erdman, 2016; Smyth, 2010). In addition, Merleau-Pontian attempts at exploring further organizational memorialization could try to include more systematically the notions of "intercorporeity" and "flesh" in the analysis of legitimacy claims and the experience of legitimacy claims. How are today's embodied experience(s) of legitimacy claims different to those of the managers and customers of the 80s, 40s or 20s?

Conclusion

The relationship between the past, the present and the future is not just a matter for academic but also a subject for more instrumental histories, those that organizations construct through their memorialization. The fabric of legitimacy claims requires tight statements linking an imagined past and present in a memory that frames and paves the way(s) to a future. Embodied practices that curate, display and memorialize aspects of organizations maintain and reinvent connections for the sake of organizational legitimacy. At a time when presentism and immediacy dominate (Hartog, 2003; Ricoeur,

2000), when time-space distantiation has become more blurred (Giddens, 1984), and when social life has become more liquid (Bauman, 2000), there is great value in adopting a chiasmatic analysis of memorialization for investigating organizational legitimacy and space. Building upon this perspective, this paper theoretically unpacked the relationships between organizational space and legitimacy management, as well as the role of memorialization and spatial legacies in these relationships.

This conceptual paper reveals the importance of key Merleau-Pontian chiasms (e.g. continuity-discontinuity, visibility-invisibility and activity-passivity), which are at stake in processes of remembering and forgetting that are constitutive of legitimacy claims. From this perspective, history appears as more than a mere 'asset' for managers or a 'material' for management and organization scientists. It is what guarantees the very presence of collective activity for the former, and a field of research for the latter. Memorialization then becomes the process that generates potentialities for sensible activities in both cases. It emerges as a sensible activity which includes doubts, forgiveness and serene relationships between the past and future of a society. In that sense, the phenomenology and indirect ontology of Merleau-Ponty (1945, 1964, 2003) thus walks hand in hand with the hermeneutics of Ricoeur (1985, 2000).

Funding acknowledgment

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Anteby, M. and Molnar, V. (2012), "Collective memory meets organizational identity: Remembering to forget in a firm's rhetorical history", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 515-540.

Ashforth, B.E. and Gibbs, B.W. (1990), "The double-edge of organizational legitimation", *Organization Science*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 177–194.

Augé, M. (2015), *Eloge du bistrot parisien*, Payot, Paris.

Barad, K. (2003), "Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter", *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 801-831.

Barros, A., Carneiro, A.D.T. and Wanderley, S. (2019), "Organizational archives and historical narratives: Practicing reflexivity in (re) constructing the past from memories and silences", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 280-294.

Basque, J. and Langley, A. (2018), "Invoking Alphonse: The founder figure as a historical resource for organizational identity work", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 12, pp. 1685-1708.

Bauman, Z. (2000), *Liquid modernity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Berti, M., Simpson, A. and Clegg, S.R. (2018), "Making a place out of space: The social imaginaries and realities of a Business School as a designed space", *Management Learning*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 168–186.

Bitektine, A. (2011), "Toward a theory of social judgments of organizations: The case of legitimacy, reputation, and status", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 151-179.

Brown, G., Lawrence, T.B. and Robinson, S.L. (2005), "Territoriality in organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 577-594.

Brunninge, O. (2009), "Using history in organizations: How managers make purposeful reference to history in strategy processes", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 8-26.

Charle, C. and Verger, J. (1994), *Histoire des universités*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Clark, P. and Rowlinson, M. (2004), "The treatment of history in organisation studies: towards an 'historic turn'? ", *Business History*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 331-352.

Clegg, S.R. (1981), "Organization and control", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 545-562.

Clegg, S.R., Courpasson, D. and Phillips, N. (2006), *Power and Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Foundations of Organization Science.

Clegg, S.R. and Kornberger, M. (2006), *Space, organizations and management theory*, Liber, Oslo.

Cloutier, C. and Langley, A. (2013), "The Logic of Institutional Logics Insights From French Pragmatist Sociology", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 360-380.

Cole, T. (2013), "The place of things in contemporary history", in Graves-Brown, P., Harrison, R. and Piccini, A. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 66-81.

Dacin, M.T., Munir, K. and Tracey, P. (2010), "Formal dining at Cambridge colleges: linking ritual performance and institutional maintenance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 6, pp. 1393-1418.

Decker, S. (2013), "The silence of the archives: Business history, post-colonialism and archival ethnography", *Management & Organizational History*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 155-173.

Decker, S. (2014), "Solid intentions: An archival ethnography of corporate architecture and organizational remembering", *Organization*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 514-542.

De Vaujany, F.X. (2019), "Legitimation process in organizations and organizing: An ontological discussion", in de Vaujany, F.X., Adrot, A., Boxenbaum, E. and Leca B. (Eds.), *Materiality in Institutions: Spaces, embodiment and technology in management and organization*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 343-378.

De Vaujany, F.X. and Aroles, J. (2019), "Nothing happened, something happened: Silence in a makerspace", *Management Learning*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 208-225.

De Vaujany, F.X. and Vaast, E. (2014), "If these walls could talk: The mutual construction of organizational space and legitimacy", *Organization Science*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 713-731.

Deroy, X. and Clegg, S.R. (2012), "Contesting the Champs-Elysées", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 355–373.

Do, B., Lyle, M.C. and Walsh, I.J. (2019), "Driving down memory lane: The influence of memories in a community following organizational demise", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 9, pp. 1307-1329.

Dowling, J. and Pfeffer, J. (1975), "Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior", *Pacific Sociological Review*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 122-136.

Drori, I. and Honig, B. (2013), "A process model of internal and external legitimacy", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 345-376.

Elsbach, K.D. and Sutton, R.I. (1992), "Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories", *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 699-738.

Erdman, M. (2016), "Historiographic Positionality and the Role of the Social Scientist: An Application of Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Phenomenology to the Study of History-Writing in Eastern Europe", *ESR Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1.

Fenske, G. and Holdsworth, D. (1900), "Corporate identity and the New York office building: 1895-1915", in Ward, D. and Zunz, O. (Eds.), *The landscape of Modernity: New York City 1900-1940*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, pp. 129-159.

Foster, W.M. and Hyatt, C.G. (2008), "Inventing team tradition: A conceptual model for the strategic development of fan nations", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 265–287.

Gagliardi, P. (1990a), *Symbols and artifacts: Views of the corporate landscape*, Walter de Gruyter.

Gagliardi, P. (1990b), "Artifacts as pathways and remains of organizational life", in Gagliardi, P. (Ed.), *Symbols and artifacts: Views of the corporate landscape*, Walter de Gruyter, pp. 3-38.

Gardner, W.L. and Martinko, M.J. (1988), "Impression management in organizations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 321–338.

Gastelaars, M. (2010), "What do buildings do? How buildings-in-use affect organizations", in van Marrewijk, A. and Yanow, D. (Eds.), *Organisational spaces: Rematerializing the workaday world*, Edward Elgar Publications, London, pp. 77-96.

Giddens, A. (1984), *The constitution of society: introduction of the theory of structuration*, University of California Press.

Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. and Fabbri, T. (2002), "Revising the past (while thinking in the future perfect tense)", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 622-634.

Gosden, C. (1994), *Social Being and Time*, Wiley-Blackwell, London.

Hancock, P. and Spicer, A. (2011), "Academic architecture and the constitution of the new model worker", *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 91-105.

Hartog, F. (2003), *Régimes d'historicité: présentisme et expériences du temps*, Seuil, Paris.

Hayles, N.K. (1999), *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. (1983), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hottin, C. (2011), "La constitution de l'espace universitaire parisien (XIIIe–XVIIIe siècle): jalons pour la redécouverte d'un patrimoine", *In Situ*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-51.

Hottin, C. (1999), "La Sorbonne: Lieu de mémoires, mémoires du lieu", *Universités et grandes écoles à Paris. Les palais de la science.* Action artistique de la Ville de Paris, pp. 125-133.

Judt, T. and Snyder, T. (2012), *Thinking the Twentieth Century*, Penguin, New York.

Kieser, A. (1987), “From asceticism to administration of wealth. Medieval monasteries and the pitfalls of rationalization”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 103–123.

Kieser, A. (1994), “Why organization theory needs historical analyses—and how this should be performed”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 608–620.

King, B.G. and Whetten, D.A. (2008), “Rethinking the relationship between reputation and legitimacy: A social actor conceptualization”, *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 192-207.

Kleinman, A. and Kleinman, J. (1994), “How bodies remember: Social memory and bodily experience of criticism, resistance, and delegitimation following China’s cultural revolution”, *New Literary History*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 707–723.

Köster, R. (2011), *Hugo Boss, 1924-1945: die Geschichte einer Kleiderfabrik zwischen Weimarer Republik und "Drittem Reich"*, CH Beck.

Lawrence, T.B., Leca, B. and Zilber, T.B. (2013), “Institutional work: Current research, new directions and overlooked issues”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 8, pp. 1023–1033.

Lawrence, T.B. and Suddaby, R. (2006), “Institutions and institutional work”, in Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Nord, W.R. (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*, Sage, London, pp. 215–254.

Le Goff, J. (2006), “L’histoire nouvelle”, in Le Goff, J. (Ed.), *La nouvelle histoire*, Editions complexes, Paris, pp. 35-63.

Le Goff, J. (2014), *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?*, Editions du Seuil, Paris.

Le Wita, B. (1994), *French bourgeois culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991), *The production of space*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Leonardi, P.M. (2013), "Theoretical foundations for the study of sociomateriality", *Information and Organization*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 59–76.

Leonardi, P.M. and Barley, S.R. (2010), "What Is Under Construction Here? Social Action, Materiality, and Power in Constructivist Studies of Technology and Organizing", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 1–51.

Lounsbury, M. and Glynn, M.A. (2001), "Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22 No. 6-7, pp. 545–564.

Lowenthal, D. (1985), *The past is a foreign country*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lowenthal, D. (2014), "Landscape as heritage", in Fladmark, J.D. (Ed.), *Heritage: Conservation, Interpretation and Enterprise*, Routledge, London, pp. 3-16.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C. and Clegg, S.R. (2016), "Conceptualizing historical organization studies", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 609-632.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C. and Gordon, J. (2013), "Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 7, pp. 747–763.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C., Gordon, J. and Shaw, E. (2015), "Identity, storytelling and the philanthropic journey", *Human Relations*, Vol. 68 No. 10, pp. 1623–1652.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C. and Stringfellow, L.J. (2017) "Narrative, metaphor and the subjective understanding of historic identity transition", *Business History*, Vol. 59 No. 8, pp. 1218-1241.

Mazis, G.A. (2016), *Merleau-Ponty and the Face of the World: Silence, Ethics, Imagination, and Poetic Ontology*, SUNY Press, New York.

Mazza, C. (1999), *Claim, intent, and persuasion: Organizational legitimacy and the rhetoric of corporate mission statements*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945/2013), *Phénoménologie de la perception*, Gallimard, Paris.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964), *Le visible et l'invisible: suivi de notes de travail*, Gallimard, Paris.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2003/2015), *L'institution, la passivité. Notes de cours au Collège de France (1954-1955)*, Editions Belin, Paris.

Meyer, R.E., Höllerer, M.A., Jancsary, D. and van Leeuwen, T. (2013), "The visual dimension in organizing, organization, and organization research: Core ideas, current

developments, and promising avenues", *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 487-553.

Mills, A.J., Weatherbee, T.G. and Durepos, G. (2014), "Reassembling Weber to reveal the-past-as-history in management and organization studies", *Organization*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 225-243.

Navis, C. and Glynn, M.A. (2010), "How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynamics of legitimacy, identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990–2005", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 439–471.

Olick, J.K. and Robbins, J. (1998), "Social memory studies: From "collective memory" to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 105–140.

Orlikowski, W.J. (2007), "Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work", *Organization studies*, Vol. 28 No. 9, pp. 1435–1448.

Patriotta, G., Gond, J.P. and Schultz, F. (2011), "Maintaining legitimacy: Controversies, orders of worth, and public justifications", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 8, pp. 1804-1836.

Peltonen, T. (2011), "Multiple architectures and the production of organizational space in a Finnish University", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 806-821.

Pesez, J. (1978), “Histoire de la culture matérielle”, in Le Goff, J. (Ed.), *La nouvelle histoire, first edition in 1978*, Editions complexes, Paris, pp. 191-215.

Petani, F.J. and Mengis, J. (2016), “In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history”, *Organization*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 71-89.

Rämö, H. (1999), “An Aristotelian human time-space manifold: From chronochora to kairotopos”, *Time & Society*, Vol. 8 No. 2-3, pp. 309-328.

Ravasi, D., Rindova, V. and Stigliani, I. (2019), “History, material memory, and the temporality of identity construction”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 62 No. 5, pp. 1523-1555.

Raviola, E. and Norbäck, M. (2013), “Bringing technology and meaning into institutional work: Making news at an Italian business newspaper”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 8, pp. 1171–1194.

Richard, B. and Waks, F. (2009), *Dauphine: de l’expérimentation à l’innovation*, Editions Textuel, Paris.

Ricoeur, P. (2000), *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*, Seuil, Paris.

Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J. and Decker, S. (2014), “Strategies for Organizational History: A Dialogue Between Historical Theory and Organization Theory”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 250-274.

Sangren, P.S. (1988), "History and the rhetoric of legitimacy: The Ma Tsu cult of Taiwan", *Comparative studies in society and history*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 674–697.

Smith, P. (2008), "Meaning and military power: Moving on from Foucault", *Journal of Power*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 275-293.

Smyth, B. (2010), "Heroism and history in Merleau-Ponty's existential phenomenology", *Continental Philosophy Review*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 167-191.

Shipp, A.J. and Jansen, K.J. (2011), "Reinterpreting time in fit theory: Crafting and recrafting narratives of fit in medias res", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 76–101.

Suchman, M.C. (1995), "Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 571-610.

Suddaby, R., Foster, W.M. and Quinn Trank, C. (2010), "Rhetorical history as a source of competitive advantage", in Joel, A.C. and Lampel, J. (Eds.), *The Globalization of Strategy Research*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 147-173.

Suddaby, R., Foster, W.M. and Mills, A.J. (2014), "Historical Institutionalism", in Bucheli, M. and Wadhwani, D. (Eds.), *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 100-123.

Suddaby, R. and Greenwood, R. (2005), "Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 35–67.

Tuilier, A. (1994), *Histoire de l'Université de Paris et de la Sorbonne: De Louis XIV à la crise de 1968* (Vol. 2), Nouvelle librairie de France, Paris.

Üsdiken, B. and Kipping, M. (2014) "History and Organization Studies: A Long-Term View", in Marcelo, B. and Daniel, W.R. (Eds.), *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 33-55.

Van Marrewijk, A. and Yanow, D. (2010), *Organisational Spaces. Rematerializing the Workaday World*, Edward Elgar, Northampton.

Van Marrewijk, A. (2009), "Corporate headquarters as physical embodiments of organisational change", *International Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 290-306.

Verger, J. (1973), *Les universités au Moyen Age*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Wadhwani, R.D., Suddaby, R., Mordhorst, M. and Popp, A. (2018), "History as Organizing: Uses of the Past in Organization Studies", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 12, pp. 1663–1683.

Zald, M.N. (1993), "Organization studies as a scientific and humanistic enterprise: Toward a reconceptualization of the foundations of the field", *Organization Science*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 513-528.

Zald, M.N. (1996), "More fragmentation? Unfinished business in linking the social sciences and the humanities", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 251-261.

Zimmerman, M.A. and Zeitz, G.J. (2002), "Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 414-431.

Appendix

Our intent was to capture the memorialization process in the present. Our narrative thus covers discontinuity-continuity, passivity-activity and visibility-invisibility present in contemporary material and aesthetic landscape of both organizations (Paris-Dauphine and La Sorbonne) as a consequence of the memorialization processes that enact them today. The embodied experience used to re-construct these processes is that of the first author. As a member of Paris-Dauphine and an inhabitant of its historical site, he had numerous opportunities to live memorizations processes and to experience the historical artifacts of Dauphine. In the context of La Sorbonne (whose historical vestiges are rare and distributed in Paris), he had the opportunity to follow several times the historical campus tour that is provided to embody the invisible history of Paris University.

Data used for our historical vignette about Paris-Dauphine

Type data	Description	Period
Observations of historical practices and artifacts	Five years of participant observations (formalized in a memo)	2009-2014
Semi-structured interviews	Five interviews (around 1.5 hours each): three with senior emeritus professors, two with senior administrative staff (who experienced had the period of the 70s in universities)	2010-2011

Archives	Centre d'archives du 20ème siècle (archives about the architect of universities) Internal archives of the university	2011-2012
Online resources	Websites (in particular https://dauphine.psl.eu/), social medias and blogs about the university	2010-2012
Pictures and movies	INA, videos on You Tubes and personal pictures (more than 4000) by the first author about internal life of the organization	2010-2012
Books and articles	Bienaymé, A., & Roux, D. (2008). Histoire de l'université Paris-Dauphine (1968-2008). Commentaire, (2), 575-583. de Vaujany, F. X., & Vaast, E. (2014). If these walls could talk: The mutual construction of organizational space and legitimacy. Organization Science, 25(3), 713-731. Gourmay, I. 1991. Jacques Carlu (1890-1976) and American Culture. Congrès annuel de la society of architecture. Langlois, C. 1978. Notice sur la vie et les travaux de M. Jacques Carlu, séance du mercredi 25 janvier 1978, Institut de France, Académie des Beaux Arts. Available at: http://www.academie-des-beaux-arts.fr Lohisse, A., F. Sogno. 2008. Architects and Librarians under Pressure: Dialoguing about Renovation of a Library in a Constrained Environment. Liber Quart. 18(2): 137-149. Raflik, J. 2007. Lorsque l'OTAN s' est installée en France. Relations internationales, 129(1): 37. Richard, B., F. Waks. 2009. Dauphine: de l'expérimentation à l'innovation. Editions Textuel, Paris. Schütze, W. 1966. La France et l'OTAN. Politique étrangère 31(2): 109-118. Werner, O. 1960. The Communication Facilities of the New NATO headquarters. Soldat und Technik 3: 124-125.	Read between 2009 and 2012

NB: The history of Dauphine has been part of another research done by François-Xavier de Vaujany and Emmanuelle Vaast about the relationship between the space of Dauphine and its legitimation (see de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014, 2016).

Data used for our historical vignette about La Sorbonne

As La Sorbonne is not an institution whose history can be directly and locally experienced (most buildings and artifacts have disappeared), we focused our observations on the experience expected to be embodied (and memorialize this history): the historical campus tour organized monthly.

Type data	Description	Period of collection
Observations	Participant observations in two campus tours about the history of La Sorbonne in September and October 2013 Two hours (by appointment from Monday to Friday and on one Saturday per month) Registration by email	2013
Online resources	Texts, maps, leaflets, savings of the following websites: https://www.sorbonne.fr/la-sorbonne/histoire-de-la-sorbonne/ (official history provided by La Sorbonne itself and read as such) https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sorbonne https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/University_of_Paris	2013
Pictures and movies	Pictures (30) during the tours completed in 2013. See also the historical accounts provided by these two TV shows: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fI9-iMgD5sM (Secrets d'Histoire) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TOv64_rl_m4 (Des racines et des ailes).	2013
Books and articles	Bonnerot, J. (1927). *La Sorbonne sa vie, son rôle, son œuvre à travers les siècles*, Paris : PUF. Bresc-Bautier, G. (Ed) (2007). *La Sorbonne : Un musée, ses chefs-d'œuvre*, Paris, RMN, 2007 Hottin, C. (1999). « La Sorbonne : Lieu de mémoires, mémoires du lieu. Universités et grandes écoles à Paris ». Les palais de la science. Action artistique de la Ville de Paris, pp. 125-133. Full text can be accessed here: https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/file/index/docid/88975/filename/christianhottin_1999_Sorbonne.pdf Duvernet, J. (1791). Histoire de la Sorbonne dans laquelle on voit l'influence de la théologie sur l'ordre social (Vol. 2). Buisson. Glorieux, P. (1966). *Aux origines de la Sorbonne : Robert de Sorbon, l'homme, le Collège, les documents*, Paris, Vrin, coll. « Études de philosophie médiévale ». Musselin, C. 2004. The Long March Of French Universities. London: Routledge. Weisz, G. (1979). L'idéologie républicaine et les sciences sociales. Les durkheimiens et la chaire d'histoire d'économie sociale à la Sorbonne. Revue française de sociologie, 83-112.	